



## **KIRLOSKAR BROTHERS LIMITED**

A Kirloskar Group Company

4SEC/ F:25

Enriching Lives

January 14, 2026

### **BSE Limited**

Corporate Relationship Department,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, New Trading Ring,  
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,  
Dalal Street, Mumbai – 400 001.

**(BSE Scrip Code – 500241)**

### **National Stock Exchange of India Ltd.**

5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Exchange Plaza,  
Bandra (East),  
Mumbai - 400 051.

**(NSE Symbol - KIRLOSBROS)**

Dear Sir/Madam,

#### **Sub: Disclosure under Regulation 30 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015**

Pursuant to Regulation 30 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (“**LODR Regulations**”), and in continuation of our disclosures dated July 4, 2018, January 21, 2025, August 12, 2025, October 11, 2025 and October 19, 2025, we hereby inform you that the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, vide its order dated January 9, 2026 has made the interim stay earlier granted vide its Interim Order dated October 17, 2025 staying the order of the Hon’ble Bombay High Court dated October 11, 2025 absolute, subject to the final decision of the Hon’ble Bombay High Court in the appeal pending before it.

The Hon’ble Supreme Court clarified that none of the observations made in the Interim Order dated October 17, 2025, or in the order dated January 9, 2026 shall be treated as an opinion expressed on the merits of the case and the parties would be at liberty to raise all contentions which may be available to them in facts and on law. The Hon’ble Supreme Court further requested the Hon’ble Bombay High Court to ensure that the appeal is disposed of expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the period of this order being placed before it.

A copy of the order dated January 9, 2026, which was received only on January 13, 2026, is enclosed herewith. Expected financial implication of the aforesaid litigation cannot be ascertained at this juncture.

We shall keep the exchange informed of any further developments in the matter.

You are requested take the above on your records.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

For **KIRLOSKAR BROTHERS LIMITED**

Devang Trivedi  
**Company Secretary**

Encl.: As above.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal Nos. 144-145/2026  
@SLP (C) Nos. 29662-29663/2025

KIRLOSKAR PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

KIRLOSKAR BROTHERS LIMITED

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. These appeal(s) impugn an order dated 10.10.2025 which modifies the earlier order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Commercial Appeal From Order No. 6/2025.
4. On 17.10.2025, after considering the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, a detailed interim order was passed, which is reproduced below:

“1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The first respondent instituted a suit wherein he had prayed for temporary injunction, inter alia, in the following terms:

“(F) During the pendency of the present suit, this Hon’ble Court by way of temporary injunction may kindly be pleased to restrain the Defendant from creating any third-party interest whatsoever including granting license/user of the Trademarks covered under the Agreements detailed and listed in para 16 and 42(N) of the Plaintiff and/or making any assignment thereof in favour of any third party.’

3. The aforesaid prayer was accepted by order of the trial court dated 9th January 2025 against which appeal was preferred before the High Court by the petitioner herein, which is pending. By order dated 25th July 2025, the High Court stayed the order of the Trial Court dated 9th January 2025 insofar as it allowed the interim injunction application (Ex.128) in terms of prayer (F). However, it was provided that though appellant may create license in respect of Kirloskar mark in accordance with Articles of Association in favour of its member companies, but it shall not assign the mark to other Kirloskar group of companies for use in respect of similar/overlapping business of Kirloskar Brothers.

4. The aforesaid order dated 25th July 2025 was corrected/modified by

order dated 10th October 2025 whereby in addition to assignment even licensing to group companies was injuncted.

5. The submission on behalf of the petitioner is that the order passed by the High Court dated 25th July 2025 is inconsistent inasmuch as on the one hand the order notices that there was non-exclusive license in favour of the plaintiff, and there existed no dispute as regards ownership of Kirloskar trade mark with the petitioner, yet it restrained the proprietor of the trade mark (i.e., the petitioner) from assigning it. It has also been argued that the term assignment may imply transfer of rights whereas licensing is limited to creating a privilege. In that sense, the order dated 25th July 2025 was not so harsh on the petitioner as is the modified order (i.e., order dated 25th July 2025 read with order dated 10th October 2025).

6. Based on the aforesaid submissions, it has been prayed that for now the order dated 25th July 2025 as modified by order dated 10th October 2025 must be stayed to the extent it restrains the petitioner from licensing the Kirloskar mark to other Kirloskar Group Companies for use in respect of similar/ overlapping business of Kirloskar Brothers.

7. Per contra, the learned senior counsel for the respondent (plaintiff) submitted that the appeal of the petitioner is pending before the High Court and, therefore, expression of opinion on merits of the case may not be appropriate at this stage. It has

also been submitted that it had been a longstanding practice of the group that competing interests are not created within the group and the clarification order dated 10th October 2025 only serves the said purpose. In such circumstances, it is submitted that there is no justification to interfere with the impugned order particularly when the appeal is pending for consideration before the High Court.

8. Having regard to the rival submissions, at this stage, we do not deem it necessary to express any opinion on the merits of the rival contentions, however, we are of the *prima facie* view that the order dated 10th October 2025, which expands the scope of the restraint imposed earlier vide order dated 25th July 2025, ought not to have been passed when the appeal is pending for consideration and full facts in respect of any earlier licensing of such Kirloskar mark within the group companies have not been discussed.

9. Accordingly, we deem it appropriate to issue notice, returnable on 4th November 2025. List on 4th November 2025 for hearing. In the meantime, the parties may exchange their affidavits/ written submissions.

10. In the meantime, we deem it appropriate to stay the effect and operation of the order dated 10th October 2025 by which the earlier order dated 25 July 2025 was modified.

11. I.A. No.264927/2025 shall be considered on the next date. In the meantime, the parties are at

liberty to file response to the said I.A."

5. The submission on behalf of the respondent is that the order dated 10.10.2025 is clarificatory in nature as it makes the operative portion of the order dated 25.07.2025 in sync with the observations made in paragraph 21.

6. On behalf of the appellant(s), it is submitted that if the modification is allowed to stand it would have serious consequences as licensing is only a grant of privilege while retaining the rights with the licensor whereas assignment may include transfer of rights. Moreover, how could owner of the trademark be restrained from exercising its ownership rights by way of an interim order and therefore, it is suggested, this appeal may be disposed of by making the interim order dated 17.10.2025 absolute subject to final decision in the appeal pending before the High Court.

7. Upon consideration of the rival submissions, we are of the view that, as it is not in dispute between the parties that the appeal before the High Court is pending and all the aforesaid aspects can be considered by the High Court while arriving at a decision in the pending appeal, ends of justice would be served if these appeals are disposed of by making the operative portion of the interim order dated 17.10.2025, as contained in paragraph 10 thereof, absolute subject to final decision in the appeal pending before the High Court.

8. We deem it appropriate to clarify that any observation made in our interim order dated 17.10.2025, or in this order, shall not be treated as an opinion expressed on the merits of the case and the parties would be at liberty to raise all contentions which may be available to them in facts and on law.

9. Considering that the appeal pending before the High Court has commercial

implications, we deem it appropriate to request the High Court to ensure that the appeal is disposed of expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date a copy of the order is placed before it.

10. The appeal(s) and all pending applications shall stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

.....J  
[MANOJ MISRA]

.....J  
[MANMOHAN]

New Delhi;  
January 09, 2026

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal Nos. 144-145/2026  
@SLP (C) Nos. 29662-29663/2025

KIRLOSKAR PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

KIRLOSKAR BROTHERS LIMITED

Respondent(s)

IA No. 262589/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT

IA No. 264927/2025 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION

IA No. 264642/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL  
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 264325/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL  
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 09-01-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Appellant(s) :

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Balbir Singh, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Tushar Ajinkya, Adv.  
Ms. Pratiksha Sharma, AOR  
Ms. Sukanya Sehgal, Adv.  
Ms. Misha Matlani, Adv.  
Mr. Rohan Padhke, Adv.  
Ms. Ritu Choudhary, Adv.  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Ranjeeta Rohtagi, Adv.  
Ms. Shivali, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

M/S. Khaitan & Co., AOR  
Mr. Gopal Subramanian, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Aarohi Bhalla, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Nishad Nadkarni, Adv.

Mr. Nirupam Lodha, Adv.  
Mr. Ravi Bhardwaj, Adv.  
Mr. Hiren Kamod, Adv.  
Mr. Ashif Navodia, Adv.  
Mr. Kshitij Parashar, Adv.  
Mr. Gautam Wadhwa, Adv.  
Ms. Jaanvi Chopra, Adv.  
Mr. Jayavardhan Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Gauri Subramanian, Adv.  
Mr. Sudhant Juyal, Adv.  
Mr. Raghav Kohli, Adv.  
Mr. Vinay Tripathi, Adv.  
Mr. Vinamra Kopariha, Adv.  
Ms. Smriti Nair, Adv.

Mr. C. Aryama Sundaram, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Ankit Acharya, AOR  
Mr. Ayush Jain, Adv.

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R**

- 1. Leave granted.**
- 2. The appeal(s) and all pending applications, including intervention application shall stand disposed of in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.**

(CHETAN ARORA)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)